

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed May 28, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-5 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended herein. Claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 6 and 7 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note with appreciation that claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. In response, independent claim 1 has been amended herein to include the subject matter of claim 4, and claim 4 has been canceled.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over IEEE Std 802.1X-2001 (referred to as IEEE) in view of Chow et al. (US 2003/0058827). Applicants respectfully disagree that these rejections are proper. However, to expedite prosecution, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 4. Claims 2, 3, and 5 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

New Claims

New claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, an 802.1X protocol-based device, comprising: a Radius module, a 802.1X authentication module and a multicasting control module, wherein, wherein if the 802.1X authentication is based on port, when a subscriber attached to said port makes a request for joining in a multicasting group, the subscriber's MAC address is searched for first; if said MAC address is found, the subscriber's account number information is searched for according to said MAC address and said port number; if the 802.1X authentication is based on MAC, when a subscriber attached to said port makes a request for joining in a multicasting group, the subscriber's account number information is searched for directly according to the subscriber's MAC address and the port number.

Claim 6 patentably distinguishes over IEEE and Chow because these references do not teach or suggest these limitations of claim 6, as noted in the Office Action's reasons as to why previously pending claim 4 (which is now incorporated into claim 1) is allowable over IEEE and Chow.

Claims 6 and 7 are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Support for new claim 6 is found, without limitation, in FIG. 4, and page 11, line 6 to page 13, line 20 of the specification. Support for new claim 7 is found, without limitation, at page 7, lines 10-12 of the specification.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: August 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert A. Jensen
Robert A. Jensen
Registration No.: 61,146
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000